

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia
Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility
Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on June 5, 2001. The
following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724 (FAX) 777-3770
Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252 (FAX) 777-6241
Willem Van Aller DIST (240) 777-2994 (FAX) 777-2950
Rey Junquera DPWT (240) 777-6086 (FAX) 777-6109
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609 (FAX) 279-3737

STAFF

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478
Julie Modlin CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478
Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684 (FAX) 777-3770

OTHER ATTENDEES

Lee Jarmon Nextel (410) 953-7440 (FAX) 953-7406
Deane Mellander VoiceStream (240) 264-8658 (FAX) 264-8610
Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1652 (FAX) 457-1678
M.G. Diamond Verizon Wireless (301) 951-1564
Carolyn Mitchell Cingular Wireless
Tom King Darnestown Assoc. (301) 417-9789
Deborah Broderick Nextel (301) 536-3608
Janet Brown Jackson, Campbell (202) 457-4263 (FAX) 457-1678
Gregory James LCC for XM
Brian Parsons Nextel (202) 437-3665
Jim Golden Verizon Wireless
Jamie Stepowany Crown Castle (301) 931-7315
Maureen Smith VoiceStream
Karl Nelson VoiceStream (410) 332-8663 (FAX) 332-8184
Ed Donohue Cole, Raywid
David Primcan Site-AI for Sprint (240) 864-5185 (FAX) 864-5186
Said Bisyr TRW for DIST (240) 863-1711 (FAX) 863-1730

Action Item: Approval of May 2, 2001 Minutes: Pat Hanehan
moved the minutes be approved as written. Willem Van Aller
seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to replace
6 existing 54" antennas with 6 new 72" antennas on the
penthouse walls at the 144' level of an existing 129' Park
Montgomery Apartment building located at 8860 Piney Branch
Road in Silver Spring (Application #200105-08).

Jane Lawton asked why it was acceptable for the VoiceStream
application to be on the consent agenda. Julie Modlin explained
that this application was the same as the previous VoiceStream
applications where VoiceStream was merely changing out existing
antennas for slightly larger antennas.

Motion: Rey Junquera moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas in the bell tower at the 43' level of a 53' Our Lady of Mercy church building to be constructed at 9200 Kentsdale Drive in Potomac (Application #200012-03).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked if this was an application to place antennas in a steeple. Bob Hunnicutt explained this application was originally submitted for review some time ago when the antennas were to be attached to part of the main building. He stated the application had been revised to provide for a separate bell tower structure on which the antennas would be placed in a manner so they would not be readily visible.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 140' level of the 204' WSSC Colesville water tank located at 2201 Industrial Parkway in Silver Spring (Application #200104-19).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Pat Hanehan asked if WSSC was supportive of this application. Bob Hunnicutt stated he had discussed it with WSSC and they had no objections to this siting. Rey Junquera noted that the antennas did not appear to be placed at the top of the water tank. Willem Van Aller stated the antennas were sited lower on the side of the water tank. Mr. Hunnicutt stated there were a few omni-directional antennas already at the top of the water tank and the catwalk was probably too small in diameter to support the Sprint antennas.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 155' level of a 188' monopole at the McDonnell property located at 20315 Georgia Avenue in Brookeville (Application #200104-20).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted the recommendation was conditioned on obtaining any modifications to the Special Exception as may be necessary. In response to questions, Bob Hunnicutt explained that the structural capacity of the monopole was not an issue in accommodating the attachment of Sprint's antenna array. He stated that monopoles were quite strong and this particular monopole was designed to accommodate at least four full triangular cellular platforms. He added that there were only two platforms presently attached to this monopole.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended conditioned on Sprint obtaining any modifications to the Special Exception as may be necessary. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 77' level of an existing 120' tree monopole at the Baptist Home for Children located at 6301 Greentree Road in Bethesda (Application #200104-21).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted the recommendation was conditioned on any necessary modifications to the Special Exception to permit use of an expanded equipment shelter area. Lee Jarmon stated that Nextel was now going to locate inside the existing shelter area. Jane Lawton asked why there were no artificial tree branches on the illustration provided in the application. Bob Hunnicutt explained that the original illustration of this monopole by AT&T showed five carriers covered with artificial branches. Jane Lawton suggested the application be conditioned on the attachment utilizing artificial branches consistent with the other antennas at this site. Lee Jarmon stated Nextel would comply with that condition.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended conditioned on any modifications to the Special Exception that may be necessary and the use of artificial tree branches to conceal Nextel's antennas. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to sled mount antennas on the roof at the 100' level of an existing 96' Columbia Towers building located at 12001 Old Columbia Pike in Silver Spring (Application #200104-22).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked if there were other carriers already on this building. Ms. Modlin stated there was one microwave dish and one off-air television receive antenna.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 181' level of an existing 204' monopole at the Damascus VFD #13 located at 10211 Lewis Drive in Damascus (Application #200104-23).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton commented that this application appeared to be one that could have been added to the consent agenda since it was a straightforward, by-right application to an existing monopole which had already been reviewed and approved, and there were no conditions related to this attachment.

Motion: Rey Junquera moved the application be recommended. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 110' level of an existing 150' monopole at Sherwood High School located at 300 Olney-Sandy Spring Road in Sandy Spring (Application #200105-07).

Julie Modlin summarized the application.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 75' & 78' level on the top of an existing farm silo at Fraley Farm located at 17800 Bowie Mill Road in Derwood (Application #200105-10).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted the recommendation was conditioned on approval from the Historical Preservation Commission (HPC). In response to questions, Bob Hunnicutt explained that the antennas would extend approximately 8' above the center of the silo dome. Deane Mellander added that the site was historic, not necessarily just the silo, and that VoiceStream was scheduled to give a presentation to the HPC on June 13, 2001. He added that HPC staff had recommended approval.

Jane Lawton asked if the antennas would be painted sky blue. Deane Mellander said VoiceStream would paint them sky blue if the HPC recommended it.

Dave Niblock stated that stacking the two sets of antennas effectively increased the length of the antennas to exceed the 6' limitation in the zoning regulations. Bob Hunnicutt stated the TTFCG had previously discussed the issue of how high above a roofline antennas could rise, and it was identified as an issue the County may wish to consider for a text amendment. He stated that before text amendment changes were made to accommodate telecommunication facilities and establish the TTFCG, there was a limitation of 18' on how high antennas could extend above a roofline. That language was removed and limits were placed on the size of the antennas, limiting panel antennas to 6', which these antennas do not exceed individually. The issue of whether the antennas are on a pole-mounted device or how long that pole may be is not addressed in the existing regulations.

Jane Lawton noted that the TTFCG could condition its recommendation to approval by the Department of Permitting Services and any conditions that the HPC may set on this attachment.

{At this point in the meeting, Jane Lawton excused herself to attend a Council meeting and yielded chair of the meeting to Bob Hunnicutt.}

Mr. King stated he had seen this silo, thought it was very attractive, and did not wish to see antennas attached to it.

Maureen Smith stated that VoiceStream may be able to revise its design to include only 3 antennas at this location instead of the stacked design of two sets of 3 antennas.

Rey Junquera stated it would be helpful for the TTFCG to know what is discussed at the HPC meeting in order to learn of any concerns the HPC may have for historic sitings. This would allow

the TTFCG to take such concerns into consideration for future applications at HPC sites.

Maureen Smith noted that while it was important to have community input into these antenna sitings, the HPC is yet another review, separate from the TTFCG process. She believed it was not appropriate to confuse the two, and, although the TTFCG may wish to consider community input, it is difficult for carriers to come before the TTFCG review with all of the results from the public hearings set out in the TTFCG application. It is appropriate for community input to be an integral part of the HPC, M-NCPPC, and BOA review process, but the TTFCG review occurs prior to those hearings.

Rey Junquera replied he was simply suggesting that it is the TTFCG's responsibility to go beyond just the consideration of co-location, and the TTFCG does take into consideration community interests. He stated he thought it would be helpful to find out if the HPC had comments about these kinds of attachments that would be appropriate for the TTFCG to consider as part of its review.

In response to questions, Deane Mellander stated that notice went out to the neighboring residences and that there would be a formal hearing at the HPC.

Willem Van Aller commented that the TTFCG received letters from interested civic organizations expressing their opinion regarding the TTFCG process, and that the opinion expressed in the letters differed from the carriers' view of what the TTFCG process should be. He noted that this was an issue the TTFCG was struggling to resolve.

Ed Donohue quoted from the County staff report drafted at the time of the consideration of legislative changes to the zoning text, in which he noted that the recommendation limited the TTFCG's focus to co-location and coordination of telecommunications facilities. Bob Hunnicutt stated that to determine what was ultimately decided regarding the TTFCG, one should refer to the final legislation, not the staff report that, while part of the legislative history, is not the deciding authority for the TTFCG process.

Motion: Rey Junquera moved that the application be recommended conditioned on any stipulations set by the Department of Permitting Services or the Historical Preservation Commission. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas to the top of the chimney at the 52' level of the Chevy Chase Methodist Church located at 7001 Connecticut Avenue in Chevy Chase (Application #200105-11).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that the recommendation was conditioned on Nextel providing a structural analysis of the chimney verifying it could safely accommodate the antennas, and compliance with §59-A-6.14 regarding the

equipment shelter. Bob Hunnicutt explained there were two chimneys at the facility - one was a shorter, stone chimney visible from Connecticut Avenue, and the second one was a brick chimney on the other side of the building. He noted it was the latter chimney which Nextel was attaching its antennas to. Nextel concurred that the antennas would be attached to the taller chimney at the back of the church. Pat Hanehan stated he thought the antennas should be painted the color of the bricks.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended conditioned on Nextel providing a structural analysis to the Department of Permitting Services that verifies the antennas may be safely attached to the chimney and providing a copy to the TTFCG prior to construction, and compliance with §59-A-6.14 regarding the location of the equipment shelter. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

{At this point, Ms. Lawton returned from the Council meeting to chair the TTFCG meeting.}

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 180' level of an existing 230' lattice tower on the Benmar Property located at 18500 Elmer School Road in Poolesville (Application #200105-12).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted the recommendation was conditioned on Sprint providing a structural analysis that verifies attachment may be safely accomplished.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended conditioned on Sprint providing a structural analysis to the Department of Permitting Services that verifies the antennas may be safely attached and providing a copy to the TTFCG prior to construction. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Montgomery County application to attach antennas to the roof wall at the 118' level of the 111' Hyatt Regency Bethesda building located at 1 Bethesda Metro Center in Bethesda (Application #200105-15).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Willem Van Aller explained that this site was part of the County's Public Safety radio system and would link to the signal transmissions from the Metro Rail system in this area. The antennas receive signals from the transmitters at the Metro tunnel entrances. He noted that the antennas would not be obtrusive and that this was a very important siting.

Rey Junquera asked if a lease had been executed for this property. Mr. Van Aller stated a County sub-contractor was handling the lease, but he had been informed that the site was ready for the antenna attachment.

Motion: Rey Junquera moved the application be recommended. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was approved with Willem Van Aller abstaining.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to construct a new

150' monopole on the Hungerford Property located at 14615 Clopper Road in Boyds (Application #200105-09).

Julie Modlin noted that this application had been tabled at the request of the carrier. In response to questions, Maureen Smith stated the application was tabled pending further RF analysis.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 125' monopole/lightpole and place antennas at the 120' level at North Bethesda Middle School located at 8935 Bradmoor Drive in Bethesda (Application #200105-14)

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Bob Hunnicutt explained that he believed this was a good siting even though it was in a residential area because the pole would be blocked from view by the school on one side, a long line of trees at the other side, and was far away from many residences on the other two sides. He added that this recommendation is conditioned on a requirement for the pole design to accommodate at least one additional set of antennas because the structure is so tall. He stated that last month the group reviewed a Sprint "unipole" for the Tilden Middle School. The Tilden unipole was a much shorter structure but one that could accommodate an additional set of antennas. He stated he had asked Sprint about accommodating additional carriers on this lightpole and was told it could only accommodate a single set of antennas at 120'. He stated that given the County's interest in establishing facilities for co-location and the greater height of this pole, he believed it was appropriate for the pole design to include another set of antennas in the same configuration as Sprint's.

Willem Van Aller asked if there was another pole for lighting the other half of the tennis courts. Pat Hanehan replied that there was just the single set of lights, and that in reviewing this siting with the School Principal, the School wanted to retain control of the switch for the lights. Mr. Van Aller asked if the community had been advised of this proposal. Mr. Hanehan replied that notice had gone out and that this siting would go through the Mandatory Referral process. Mr. Hanehan noted that his only concern with this location was that it was very close to the Baptist Home monopole where the Sprint antennas could also be attached. However, he stated he understood Sprint had made a business decision not to attach to that monopole because the rent was too high for the additional ground space needed to accommodate Sprint's equipment shelter.

Jane Lawton commented that residents usually object to lights at recreational facilities in residential neighborhoods. Pat Hanehan noted that was why the School Principal wanted control of the lights - to resolve any resident complaints.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and it was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Discussion Items - Carrier Annual Site Plans: Bob Hunnicutt explained that the Tower Coordinator was required to manage the annual plan information provided by carriers, but that he was having difficulty obtaining complete plans. He stated that some of

the plans did not contain all of the information required by the County and some were often submitted very late. He added that in some cases, he only received a map with "dots" on it, with no supporting documentation to identify the locations indicated by the dots. He added that carriers have submitted applications for new towers or monopoles that are not included in their annual plan, even though the carrier knew these applications were pending when the annual plans were prepared and submitted.

Jane Lawton stated that it was extremely important and fundamental to the Tower Coordination process to have complete annual plans from the carriers as required. She advised the Tower Coordinator not to accept any applications from carriers who did not have a current annual plan which provided complete information. Ms. Lawton added that she would like the Tower Coordinator to prepare a list of the status of annual plans by carrier and submit it to the TTFCG at the next meeting.

In response to questions, Mr. Hunnicutt stated that the requirements of the annual plan were contained in the Executive Regulations excerpt "Guide For Wireless Service Provider Facility Location Plans" handout which he distributed at the meeting. In response to questions regarding the date of the annual updates, Mr. Hunnicutt stated that some carriers thought it was on a calendar year, others thought it was a year from the last submission. Some also thought the plans should only show sites that are planned for construction within the next year, even if the plans are not submitted until halfway through the 12-month period. It was decided to require plans to be updated annually as of August 1, since that is when the TTFCG was first established, and that the projected growth plans should include all planned sites, regardless of estimated build dates.

Discussion Item - Comments on Proposed Tower Process Changes from Citizen Group: Jane Lawton stated that she had the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Francis regarding proposed tower process changes, a letter from the Planning Board, and a list of concerns the TTFCG had developed over the last year for other amendments the County may wish to consider. She stated she also had just received a letter from the carriers requesting a meeting to discuss information appropriate for submission for the TTFCG review process. She stated she did not want to discuss these items today but directed the TTFCG members to review these documents and prepare their comments for upcoming meetings.

Mr. King asked when this item would be discussed, as he just received the citizens' letter at today's meeting. Ms. Lawton reminded Mr. King that, at his request, her office had mailed him a copy of the letter approximately six weeks ago, so he should have had the letter for quite some time. She added that this item would be discussed over the next several months, perhaps in a number of different meetings. She was unsure if this issue would be discussed as a sub-committee item or during a regular TTFCG meeting, but whenever it was discussed, it would be at a meeting open to the public.

In response to questions, Ms. Lawton added that since the

Council and other agencies had expressed an interest in these matters, there may be several different meetings held to address comments from all interested parties. She concluded that there would be ample opportunity for input on this matter.

Discussion Item - TTFCG Meeting Schedule: Bob Hunnicutt distributed tentative meetings dates for the remainder of the year to the group. The group agreed that the dates were acceptable and approved the meeting dates as submitted.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, July 11, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. in the Consumer Affairs Conference Room #225 of the COB.